

REMARKS

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

4. Claims 1-10,12, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Regarding independent claims 1 and 12, the original specification does not provide the support for the amended limitation "in which the data comprise no more than a subset of coordinate points representing the handwriting motion".

Without conceding the examiner's position, claims 1 and 12 have been amended.

Regarding claim 47, the original specification does not disclose, "extracting a phone number from the handwritten information". The Applicant needs to clearly point the exact location (page and line number) for the support of the claimed language.

See page 8, lines 16-21.

- 5. Claims 42-43 are objected to because of the following informalities: the ending of the two claims by a comma ",". Appropriate correction is required.**
- 6. Claim 45 is objected to because of the following informalities: there is no ending for the claim, "or". Appropriate correction is required.**

Claims 42, 43, and 45 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

8. Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Yamakita, Tooru EP 0 865 192 and further in view of Rhee U.S. Patent No. 6,137,908.

Regarding claim 1, Yamakita teaches a method comprising: Receiving handwriting data (writing data on portable terminal) electronically from a remote user at a handwritten-information server (host device) (page 1, column 1), and Processing the handwriting data in accordance with instructions provided to the server by the user (page 1, column 2). However, Yamakita does not explicitly teach the receiving of handwritten-information data by a subset or coordinate points, which represents handwriting motion captured electronically. Rhee further teaches a handwriting recognition method further comprises the method of receiving handwritten-information in a subset of coordinate points format representing handwriting motion captured electronically points (a limited amount of essential x-y data) (column 5, lines 40-50). Modifying Yamakita's method of processing handwriting according to would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use vector (x, y coordinate) to capture motion of the handwriting and thus record handwriting information. This would improve processing and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to modify Yamakita according to Rhee.

2. Applicant's arguments with regard to claims 1-2, 4-5, and 1-10 have been fully considered, but are not considered persuasive because of the following reasons:

Regarding claim 1, the Applicant argues (pages 6-7) that Rhee U.S. Patent No. 6,137,908 teaches away from the claim invention of receiving "a subset of coordinate points". The Applicant further believes that (top of page 7) that "subset of coordinate points" avoids transmitting or storing the intermediate data points of each stroke so that the file size is kept small to reduce transmission cost. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this reasoning. First, the claim language does not claim, "a subset of coordinate points avoids transmitting or storing the intermediate data points of each stroke so that the file is kept small to reduce transmission cost" for the Examiner fully consider as explained by the Applicant. If the Applicant would like the Examiner to narrow the interpretation in art rejection entirely as claimed in the specification, the Applicant is advised to consider applying 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. Until then, the Examiner will reject the invention as claimed (emphasis added). Thus, Rhee teaches a subset of coordinate points (a limited amount of essential x-y data) (column 5, lines 40-50). Also, when considering the amended claim 1, the specification does not provide the support the amended language "in which the data comprise no more than a subset of coordinate points representing the handwriting motion".

Regarding claim 3, Yamakita teaches the method which the handwriting data is generated by a special pen (page 2, lines 45-47). Yamakita does not explicitly teach wherein the pen can be electronic wireless pen. Lee further teaches a method processes handwriting wherein handwriting data is generated by an electronic wireless pen (column 3, lines 24-25 and FIG. 5). Modifying Yamakita's method of processing handwriting data according to Lee would able to provide a wireless pen in providing the wireless capability for the apparatus. This would improve processing and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to modify Yamakita according to Lee.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the data is captured by the pen. Lee clearly states "The pen 24 does not comprise any electronic components. Any object can be used to cause reaction of the **touch panel** (as indicated at 8 in FIG. 2) by giving it a pressure" (col. 3, line 67 – col. 4, line 4, emphasis added). As such, the pen of Lee cannot itself capture any data. In contrast, as explained in detail in the specification, amended claim 1 describes a pen that captures handwriting by a user of the pen "electronically" – it is not merely a passive input to a digitizing tablet as in each of Yamakita, Lee, and Rhee.

Yamakita, Lee, and Rhee each describe a tablet that senses the presence of a passive pen. Yamakita also describes imaging separate writing on paper using a camera. Specifically, in Yamakita: "The LCD display unit 11 has a **touch panel function**. Therefore, the portable terminal 1 can process handwritten input information." (¶ 0038, emphasis added.) Note that in figure 12, the camera 12 used to image the separate paper is part of the terminal of figure 2: "The portable terminal 1 has an LCD display unit 11, a camera 12..." (¶ 0038). It is used to record separate writings: "a memo desired to be subjected to the image recognition is written on paper

Q. The paper Q having the memo written thereon is placed on a desk or the like having a color different form that of the paper Q. **When imaging the paper Q by using the camera 12, a camera input region P including the paper Q is imaged.**” (¶ 0076, emphasis added.)

As quoted above, Lee describes a touch panel reactive to “any object” (col. 3, line 68).

Rhee explains that its “tablet may include a conventional grid of conductive strips underlying the screen 28. The pen 26 serves as a probe having a conductive tip. **The position of the tip is detected by the grid** when the user brings the tip into contact with the screen.” (Col. 3, lines 19-23, emphasis added.)

Thus, none of Yamakita, Lee, or Rhee describes or would have made obvious “data representing handwriting motion captured electronically by an electronic wireless pen.”

9. Claims 3, 6, 12-13 and 38-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Yamakita, Tooru EP 0 865 192 and further in view of Rhee U.S. Patent No. 6,137,908 as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Lee U.S. Patent No. 5,347,477.

For claim 12, please refer back to claims 3 and 6 for the teaching of wireless communication. In addition, Yamakita teaches the concept of storing (computer) (page 2, column 1, line 30).

Referring to claim 13, please refer back to claims 3, 6 and 12 for the teaching of wireless communication. Furthermore, Yamakita teaches a method providing an interactive user interface on a screen of a mobile device to enable a user to control functions (commands) applied (page 7, column 11, lines 39-47) to the stored handwriting information (simple interface) (page 2, column 2, lines 40-45).

Referring to claim 13, the Applicant argues (bottom of page 7) Yamakita Reference does not describe and would not have made obvious storing handwriting information in a server and enable the user to control functions applied to the stored handwriting information after the handwriting information has been stored in the server. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Yamakita teaches a method of providing an interactive interface for mobile device such as mobile camera or fax to communicate with host device (where data stored) and able to use provided functions to interact with stored handwriting information (page 2, column 1, lines 27-50; page 3, column 3, lines 25-50). Thus, the rejections of all of the claims are maintained.

Claims 12 and 13 have been amended similarly to claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

New claim 49 recites that handwriting motion data is captured electronically at a mobile device, transmitted wirelessly to a communication device, and transmitted from there to a handwritten-information server. None of the cited references contains this combination of features.

Applicant : Ilya Schiller et al.
Serial No. : 09/832,340
Filed : April 10, 2001
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 19965-004001

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

No fees are believed to be due at this time. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, attorney docket 19965-004001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/30/01



David L. Feigenbaum
Reg. No. 30,378

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906